2874

AMENDMENT TRANSMITTAL LETTER (Small Entity) Applicant(s): Gary O'Connor						Docket No. 7385-82593	
		ng Date 04/2002	Examiner Pak, Sung H.			Group Art Unit 2874	
OCT 2 0 2003	MMUNICATIONS ASS	EMBLY DISABLI	NG MECHA	NISM			
THE TRADEMARK	<u>T</u> (	O THE COMMISSI	IONER FOR	PATENTS:			
Small Enterprised	with is an amendment atity status of this applically submitted.  It statement to establish a calculated and is trans	ation has been est	tablished under some some some some some some some some	er 37 CFR 1.2		erified statement	
CLAIMS AS AMENDED							
	CLAIMS REMAINING	HIGHEST #	NUMBI	ER EXTRA	RATE	ADDITIONAL	
	AFTER AMENDMENT	PREV. PAID FOR	R CLAIMS	PRESENT		FEE - \$0.00	
TOTAL CLAIMS	16 -	20 =	-		<b>A</b> 40	.00 \$0.00 3.00 \$0.00	
Multiple Depende	ent Claims (check if ann		<u>'</u>		x \$43	\$0.00	
Multiple Dependent Claims (check if applicable)  TOTAL ADDITIONAL FEE FOR THIS AMENDMENT							
Please ch A check i The Direct communi Any	onal fee is required for harge Deposit Account in the amount of ctor is hereby authorized ication or credit any over additional filing fees repatent application process.	to cover the to cover the ed to charge payme erpayment to Deposequired under 37 C.	osit Account N .F.R. 1.16. 37 CFR 1.17	enclosed. owing fees as No. 23-0920		RECEIVED  OCT 23 2003  TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800  with	
Jon P. Christense Reg. No. 34,137	en e			com 10/16/2003 first class mail Commissioner 22313-1450.	I under 37 C r for Patents Lyre of Perso	ment and fee is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service C.F.R. 1.8 and is addressed to the state of Person Mailing Correspondence of Person Mailing Correspondence	

O DE 2 1000 USE SEE 593

PATENT

OCT 23 2003 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Gary O'Connor Art Unit: 2874

Serial No.: 10/037,507

Filed: January 4, 2002

For: COMMUNICATION ASSEMBLY

DISABLING MECHANISM

Attorney

Docket No.: 82593

AMENDMENT A

Assistant Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In response to the Office Action of July 21, 2003, please amend the above-identified application as follows:

## REMARKS

1. Reconsideration and further prosecution of the above-identified application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and discussion that follows. Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. Claims 1-6 and 9-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Pat. Pub. No. US 2003/0103735 to Anderson et al. Claims 7-8 and 15-16 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if

rewritten in independent form. After a careful review of the specification and claims, it has been concluded that the restrictions are in error and the restrictions are, therefore, traversed.

2. Claims 1-6 and 9-14 have been rejected as being obvious over Anderson et al. In particular, the Examiner asserts that

"Anderson et al reference discloses an optical device with all the limitations set forth in the claims, except it does not teach the axis of transmission from an optical source being perpendicular to the axis of plug insertion. the less, Anderson et al reference does disclose: optical plug and receptacle (Fig. 2); disposing an optical source and a receiver on a side wall of the receptacle with the axis of transmission from the optical source to the receiver directed into and across a plug space (Fig. 3A); interlocking the connection between the plug and the optical source when the detector received the signal form the optical source (Fig. 4, Abstract); the optical source being a light emitting diode, and the receiver being a photodiode.

However, disposing the optical sources and receivers such that the axis of transmission from the optical source is perpendicular to the plug insertion axis, is well known and commonly used in the optical module art. Such an arrangement allows for better optical alignment between the optical source and the fiber connectors with the use of alignment lens or mirrors. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Anderson et al. device to have optical source and receiver disposed such that their axis of transmission is perpendicular to the axis of plug insertion."

It is noted first that Anderson et al. is drawn to the use of ferrules 114 instead of plugs and receptacles. The fact that Anderson et al. does not use plugs and receptacles is demonstrated by the fact that the ferrule 114 is mounted on top of an array of optoelectronic devices 106 with a first adhesive 116 (Anderson et al., par. 0050). In addition, "To further mechanically stabilize the first ferrule 112 to the flexible printed circuit board 102, a dam 120 may be formed on the flexible printed circuit board 102 and filled with a second adhesive 122" (Anderson et al., par 0051). As would be clear to those of skill in the art, if Anderson et al. used plugs and receptacles, adhesives would not be required (or even described).

It is noted next that Anderson et al. is directed to "the precise axial alignment between the array of optical fibers 114 and array of optoelectronic devices 106" (Anderson et al., par 0050). Since Anderson et al. uses ferrules 112 and not receptacles and since the optoelectronic devices 106 are precisely aligned with optical fiber 114, there is no "optical source and receiver in a sidewall of the receptacle with an axis of transmission from the optical source to the receiver" (claim 1, lines 3-4).

G

It is noted next that the Examiner asserts that "disposing the optical sources and receivers such that the axis of transmission from the optical source is perpendicular to the plug insertion axis, is well known and commonly used in the optical module art". The applicant respectfully traverses this assertion. Optical connectors transmit optical signals parallel to a plug insertion axis because optical fibers are known to break when bent sharply. Absent a recognition of the problem solved by the

claimed invention, a person of skill in the art would not dispose an optical source perpendicular to an axis of transmission without having some precise objective in mind. If the Examiner believes that such knowledge is well known in the art, then it is respectfully requested that the Examiner provide a reference providing the factual basis for such assertion as required by 37 CFR §1.104(c)(2). If the Examiner is relying upon his own personal knowledge, then an affidavit is respectfully requested from the Examiner as required by 37 CFR §1.104(d)(2).

The Examiner asserts that Anderson et al. teaches of the use of an optical interlock. The applicant respectfully traverses this assertion. Since the Anderson et al. ferrule 112 is glued to the optoelectronic device 106, there would be no reason for an optical interlock, because the adhesive 116, 122 would prevent disassembly. If the Examiner believes that such knowledge is known or descibed in the art, then it is respectfully requested that the Examiner provide a reference providing the factual basis for such assertion as required by 37 CFR \$1.104(c)(2). If the Examiner is relying upon his own personal knowledge, then an affidavit is respectfully requested from the Examiner as required by 37 CFR \$1.104(d)(2).

CENED

Allowance of claims 1-16, as now presented, is believed to be in order and such action is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, he is respectfully requested to telephone applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted, WELSH & KATZ, LTD.

Ву

Jon P. Christensen Registration No. 34,137

October 16, 2003 WELSH & KATZ, LTD. 120 South Riverside Plaza 22nd Floor Chicago, Illinois 60606 (312) 655-1500